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Introduction

This seems to be a very sensitive issue for many Christians I have spoken with, and often, it is a topic that causes a lot of contention. There is a reason for this contention, but even though most Christians believe it to be an intellectual contention, it is not an intellectual problem; it's actually a heart problem, and we will discuss this in detail as we progress.

I want to state first and foremost that I do not believe you're going to hell for using a new-age version. However, there are some VERY serious problems with those new-age versions that are diluting the Word of God, taking away from His Word, and adding to His Word, that are causing many problems that are leavening the church; therefore, I do not take this matter lightly.

The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. -Psalm 12:6

pure (adj): clear; free from mixture; without spot; not sullied or tarnished; incorrupt; absolute; not vitiated with improper or corrupt words or phrases
(See 'pure', American Dictionary of the English Language, Noah Webster, 1828, retrieved Sept 25, 2014 [webstersdictionary1828.com])

The Word of God is perfect, without error, and untainted with evil.

Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar. -Proverbs 30:5-6

The impression I get from many Christians is that they don't seem to believe there are people out there, lead by the Devil, who purposefully want to change the Word of God to make it fit what they personally want to believe. The fact is that there have been men seeking to corrupt the Word of God since the fall of mankind about 6,000 years ago, and certainly many who have created wicked perversions of His Word from the time of Christ.

There are also many Christians who like to "paraphrase" the Word of God.

paraphrase (n): a restatement of a text or passage giving the meaning in another form, as for clearness; rewording
There’s nothing wrong with paraphrasing something for clarity, but the problem is when modern day false converts and apostates start paraphrasing something, most often including their false ideals and lack of understanding, and then claim the Word of God says whatever they paraphrased it to say. This brings about many false doctrines, and the new-age bible versions that have appeared over the last 200 years have altered God’s Word into their own paraphrasing, adding and subtracting from the Bible.

Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect. -Matthew 5:48

Only by Jesus Christ are we made perfect in the spirit, but the flesh is still wicked, so that means man can make mistakes in translation, right? Absolutely. However, God CANNOT make mistakes, so we have to ask ourselves, are we reading the Word of God, or the words of men?

The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever. -Psalm 12:6-7

Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. -Matthew 24:35, Mark 13:31 (See also Mark 13:31 & Luke 21:33)

If it’s true that the Lord God has promised us He would preserve His Word, then where is it?

The purpose of this article is to give a general overview of the arguments for and/or against the King James Bible. The full history, including all the corruptions of Greek/Latin manuscripts and lexicons, would take many volumes of books to cover. It would be nearly impossible to cover that much information in one article, so those would have to be covered in another section.

The Promise of Preservation

First of all, it is important to understand that the King James Bible is NOT the INSPIRED Word of God. The Word of God is inspired, of course, but the King James Bible is the PRESERVED Word of God.

inspire (v): to infuse or suggest ideas supernaturally; to communicate divine instructions to the mind; In this manner, we suppose the prophets to have been inspired, and the Scriptures to have been composed under divine influence or direction.
(See 'inspire', American Dictionary of the English Language, Noah Webster, 1828, retrieved Sept 25, 2014 [webstersdictionary1828.com])

Inspiration is when a man holds a pen, and with ink and paper, writes down what God tells Him to write. The King James Bible was not developed by inspiration; that was done many centuries beforehand.

preserve (v): to keep or save from injury or destruction; to defend from evil; to uphold; to sustain; to save from decay
(See 'preserve', American Dictionary of the English Language, Noah Webster, 1828, retrieved Sept 25, 2014 [webstersdictionary1828.com])

The King James Bible is the finalization of the work to preserve the Word of God. So let’s quote again from Psalm 12:

The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever. -Psalm 12:6-7

It seems very clear from the simple reading of the text that God is promising to preserve His Word for us, but remember that there are many people out there, calling themselves Christians, who do not want the Word of God to be preserved.
Many of them are so hopelessly attached to their new-age bible versions, that they will make an attempt to explain away the preserved Word of God in these verses.

Let’s start at the beginning of Psalm 12, and read through carefully:

To the chief Musician upon Sheminith, A Psalm of David.] Help, LORD; for the godly man ceaseth; for the faithful fail from among the children of men. -Psalm 12:1

We have a beginning context of wicked men becoming more common.

They speak vanity every one with his neighbour: with flattering lips and with a double heart do they speak. -Psalm 12:2

The words of the wicked are vain, and they deceive people with their words.

The LORD shall cut off all flattering lips, and the tongue that speaketh proud things: Who have said, With our tongue will we prevail; our lips are our own: who is lord over us? -Psalm 12:3-4

This is all about God cutting off from Him all the lying tongues, and that these wicked men claim to be an authority over everyone else.

For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise, saith the LORD; I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him. -Psalm 12:5

And now God is about to tell us how he’s going to protect the poor and needy from the words of lying men.

The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever. -Psalm 12:6-7

God's promise to preserve His Word protects the poor and needy from those who are deceiving them with false words. It is the way the poor and needy can know the truth.

However, many ministries out there try to claim that "them" in verse 7 is referring to the poor and needy; or that it's just the poor and needy that are preserved (protected). Although the poor and needy are given protection from the Lord Jesus Christ, the context of chapter 12 is speaking to the defense against the lying tongues of the wicked, which are countered with the pure Words of the Lord God.

A number of new-age publications have attempted to change the text in order to justify themselves in selling their bible versions. For example, the NIV has changed the text to the following: "O LORD, you will keep us safe and protect us from such people forever"

This is a deceptive change because the producers of this version purposefully ignored aspects of the Hebrew text:

"The Hebrew word 'shamar' meaning 'to keep' which the New International Version translators render 'you will keep us' is found in the future second person singular "thou shalt keep" and is directed to the THIRD person plural "them" and NOT the first person plural "us" as the New International Version translators rendered it."

-Samuel C. Gipp, "Is the King James Bible Inspired or Preserved?" A Friend to Churches Ministries, retrieved Sept 25, 2014, [samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=28.htm]
Without any Hebrew involved, the deception is still clear in the English. In elementary school, we learn how to write and speak in first, second, or third person properly according to the context, and if the NIV were submitted to a 5th grade English class assignment, they would deduct points from their grade for misuse of person in their writing. (And they know this too -- this is not an accident.)

Because the NIV has been changed tens of thousands of times, today it reads: "You, LORD, will keep the needy safe and will protect us forever from the wicked." So do you see how they have further tried to emphasize their lie by changing the first "us" to "the needy?" They are completely changing the context of the Word of God, and they are doing it to justify their sales of new-age versions.

The context of Psalm 12 is backed up by Proverbs 22:

The eyes of the LORD preserve knowledge, and he overthroweth the words of the transgressor.
-Proverbs 22:12

This is the Lord God preserving the knowledge of His Word, and that counters the words of deceptive men, just as was described in Psalm 12.

Other people will try to say that God has only preserved His Word in heaven, and not in this world (Psa 119:89), which doesn't make any logical sense whatsoever to the rest of the Bible, and God specifically told the Jews it's foolish to believe such things:

If thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which are written in this book of the law, and if thou turn unto the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul. For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? -Deuteronomy 30:10-12

The Lord God made sure that those who believe on Him can know His Word written unto them in perfection here on earth, but new-agers seem to want to convince people that no one can know God's Word.

And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. -John 8:32

How can we know the truth if God has it locked away in heaven? Thus, what many ministers will argue is that the Word of God cannot be fully known, and we must rely on the words of men, which are fallible, to create a "supposedly" infallible book, and that's a complete contradiction.

This is a very appealing concept to the new-age apostate church, because they claim their faith in a "perfect god" and "perfect bible," but then there is no way to TEST their "god" and "bible" to see if it's perfect. Anytime someone challenges them, they just respond with "that's just your interpretation," which gives them a quick one-liner to escape any judgment and rebuke that would cause them to have to turn from their wicked ways.

If that's the case, we might as well just leave the Bible up to some monkeys with type-writers, because without an absolute truth that we can rely on, nothing can be known for certain. That leads us to the next point, that we must have preservation of the perfect inspiration of God, or else inspiration becomes meaningless.

(Read "How to Talk With Atheists" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)
The Necessity of Perfection

For thou [Satan] hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. -Isaiah 14:13-14

Obviously, there is a war that Satan is trying to win against God. Of course, it is impossible for Satan to win that war, so he instead takes out his aggression on mankind, working continually to deceive them. One of the most effective ways to win a war is to cut off communication between the leader and his army.

"As it advances into enemy territory, an army establishes and protects its essential lines of communication."

Communication is vital, because if an army doesn't know which way to go, or what actions to take for its defenses, then it can easily be infiltrated and destroyed. A crafty general may not only seek to cut off communication, but if he can forge false communications to give the enemy the wrong instructions, it becomes much easier to win the war.

The Word of God in the Bible is God's communication to his people, and if that communication is altered in any way, it removes important instructions for us.

Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners. -1 Corinthians 15:33

Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices. -2 Corinthians 2:11

God's Word gives us an understanding of the devices of Satan, as well as the inventions of men; things we use to deceive ourselves. Without a proper understanding of sin and wickedness, we will not have a proper understanding of the real enemy.

"So it is said that if you know your enemies and know yourself, you can win a hundred battles without a single loss. If you only know yourself, but not your opponent, you may win or may lose. If you know neither yourself nor your enemy, you will always endanger yourself."
-Sunzi & Han Hiong Tan, Sun Tzu: The Art of War, Published H H TAN Medical PTY LTD, 2002, p. 6, ISBN; 9780958006705

"All warfare is based on deception... I will force the enemy to take our strength for weakness, and our weakness for strength, and thus will turn his strength into weakness."
-Sunzi & Han Hiong Tan, Sun Tzu: The Art of War, Published H H TAN Medical PTY LTD, 2002, p. 6, ISBN; 9780958006705

The reason I quote from Sun Tzu here is because the Bible does not provide specifics on military training, but rather warns us of the evils of the enemy, and that we should be aware of them, and great military generals have known that understanding the enemy keeps your army protected. The Word of God is the truth, and a powerful weapon and defense against evil.

And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: -Ephesians 6:17

For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. -Hebrews 4:12
Satan (Lucifer) will do everything in his power to disrupt that weapon of God's Word. There is only one God, one Truth, and one Christ, but Satan seeks to make many of them to confuse the masses and disrupt communications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Lord God</th>
<th>Satan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Truth</td>
<td>Many lies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One God</td>
<td>Many gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Christ</td>
<td>Many christs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Way to Heaven</td>
<td>Many ways to heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Church</td>
<td>Many religions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bible</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What sense would it make to show the pattern of Satan making many versions of everything God has done, but refusing to believe that Satan would make multiple versions of God's Word? It makes absolute perfect tactical sense to make as many bible versions as possible to confuse God's people.

The greatest weapon of a Christian is an absolute, infallible book by which everyone will be judged. However, Satan hates the idea that God's Word is perfect because it means he has no chance of winning the war, so if He can disrupt Christians' communication with that perfect book, He can confuse and corrupt many more people.

As for God, his way is perfect; the word of the LORD is tried: he is a buckler to all them that trust in him.
-2 Samuel 22:31

Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect. -Matthew 5:48

Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen. -Hebrews 13:21

How are we expected to have our works perfect before God the Father, if we do not have perfection in His Word? We can only have a perfect Word of God if God preserves His Word because men can't be relied on for perfection without Jesus Christ.

In the military, if you remove one piece of equipment from the army as a whole, then you weaken it. For example, the soldiers are all fully equipped, but you remove all the tanks; the army becomes weaker. If the soldier are all fully equipped, but you remove all the grenades, the army becomes weaker. Even if you remove something as simple as boots, the army will not be prepared for combat.

The army will not be able to perform certain tasks to their full effectiveness, or they will completely fail in other areas, if they are not fully equipped when entering battle.

Likewise, if we do not have the perfect Word of God preserved for us, we will fall in combat against the spiritual enemy because our entire faith is based on that Word.

So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. -Romans 10:17

If the bible you hold in your hands has been corrupted, then your faith will be corrupted. If the bible you hold in your hands has been watered down, then your faith will be watered down. I'm not saying that anyone who has ever used a new-age version is unsaved. I'm simply saying that those who study their new-age versions are not properly equipped for combat against the spiritual darkness in this world, and they will not be able to perform certain tasks to their full effectiveness, or they will completely fail.

Later in this article, we will see how so many new-age versions have watered down the Word of God, changing, adding, and removing all sorts of doctrines, thereby making the Christians who study them much weaker. However, let's start by look at the history of the Bible, where it came from, and why we have so many versions today.
The apostles sat down and wrote letters and prophecies (e.g. Galatians, Romans, Revelation, etc) that God directly inspired them to write, and they wrote these documents on parchment or vellum (i.e. dried animal skins), which was the common 'paper' of the day. Though vellum is much more durable than paper, it too will eventually wear out and fade away over time.

When these documents are read repeatedly, being in constant use, and having exposure to natural elements that will cause them to decay, copies will need to be made. A scroll can only be unrolled and rerolled so many times over the years before it begins to wear out and the words begin to fade. The originals no longer exist because they would have been in heavy use.

Copy machines were obviously not available in that day, and the printing press was not invented until the 15th century, so copies would have to be made by hand. Remember that scribes of that day were skilled in hand-writing a copy of a document. Many defenders of the new-age versions depict these copiers 1,000-2,000 years ago as primitive, bumbling, and ignorant fools that didn't know what they were doing. (i.e. evolution-based philosophy that ancient man was dumb and modern man is smart) However, the scribes of that day were MORE skilled and dedicated than most scribes today with modern conveniences, and they had to be because there was no other method of copying.

For example, when Jews would make copies of the Bible, they took extraordinary care of what they were writing to make sure everything was letter perfect and holy before the Lord. The following author writes about the rules listed in the Talmud (Jewish commentary) for copying scrolls:

"The parchment had to be made... from the skins of clean animals. The ink had to be of no other color than black and had to be prepared according to a precise formula. No word or letter could be written from memory. The Scribe had to have an authentic copy before him, and he had to read and pronounce aloud each word before writing it. The Scribe had to reverently wipe his pen each time before writing the word for God, and he had to wash his whole body in the mikvah, the ceremonial bath, before writing the sacred Name, Jehovah (YHWH). One mistake on a sheet condemned the sheet. If three mistakes were found on any given page, the entire manuscript was condemned. Every word and every letter was counted, and if a letter was omitted, an extra letter inserted, or if one letter touched another, the manuscript was condemned and destroyed at once."


Elder Rabbis would also give a warning to new scribes:

"Take heed how thou dost do thy work, for thy work is the work of heaven, lest thou drop or add a letter of a manuscript and so become a destroyer of the world."


I give no argument against mistakes being made by scribes throughout history. Of course, there have been mistakes because men make mistakes. However, when it comes to the Word of God and His promise of preservation, He will make sure that His Word comes out perfect in the language He chooses to preserve it. The real problem that we will encounter is that when it comes to the defenders of the new-age versions, the thought of a perfect book frightens them, and they reject faith in God to preserve His Word in perfection, because they would be judged by that perfect Word.

Though defenders of new-age versions put much emphasis on error of translators, one thing I rarely hear them do is talk about deception from those translators. In most cases, it seems they think that no one would ever purposefully change the Word of God because they didn't like the doctrine it teaches, but false doctrines were being spread around during the time of Christ, through the writing of the New Testament, and still today. There is a reason they don't talk about deception, and that's because the entire foundation of their beliefs in new-age versions rests on a few random manuscripts that were created by men who changed the Word of God to match their own pagan philosophies.
A primary example of corrupting the Word of God would be the pagan Alexandrian cult in Egypt. The Alexandrians removed a lot from the original texts of Antioch (the base of operations for early Christianity), like the Lordship from Christ, the divinity of Jesus, etc. The Alexandrians are much like the Jehovah’s Witnesses today: The Christians could easily spot the counterfeit and rejected the Alexandrian manuscripts.

So the true Word of God was being rolled and unrolled repeatedly, copied, and then once the original was worn out, it was thrown out and the new copy was used. However, books that are never used do not need to be copied because they don’t wear out from exposure. The Alexandrian manuscript sat on a library shelf in Egypt because it was never used, therefore it would not wear out, therefore it was preserved.

I have copies of new-age versions on my bookshelf that still look brand new, and that’s because I hardly ever use them, but my King James Bible is more worn out than those other versions because I use it a lot. This is something I think many Bible “scholars” today do not consider, because when the Alexandrian manuscripts in Egypt were found, they thought, "These are older and well-preserved, therefore, they're better!" Older does NOT mean better. The only reason the Alexandrian documents were well-preserved is because they were an easily-recognizable fraud and no one used them.

**The Unbiblical Focus on "The Originals"**

Typically, I hear new-agers try to claim: "Well, the original says..." This is deception. The originals are gone, and it upsets many new-age version users when I point this out, but I would strongly urge Christians not to put more emphasis on the originals than God does.

In Jeremiah 36, the Lord God has Jeremiah write down God's Word to Israel. When the King was read the Word of the Lord through Jeremiah, read what he does:

> And it came to pass, that when Jehudi had read three or four leaves, he cut it with the penknife, and cast it into the fire that was on the hearth, until all the roll was consumed in the fire that was on the hearth.
> -Jeremiah 36:23

> Then the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah... Take thee again another roll, and write in it all the former words that were in the first roll, which Jehoiakim the king of Judah hath burned.
> -Jeremiah 36:27-28

Through the rage of a king who didn't want to hear the truth, the originals were destroyed, but God had Jeremiah write it down again. If God was putting emphasis on the original, then He would not have allowed the king to destroy it. Later, God actually commanded that Jeremiah destroy the secondary copies too! (Jer 51:61-64) Yet, a third copy was written down, otherwise we would not have a record of Jeremiah, so no one has the originals. Also, consider that the Ten Commandments originals were destroyed as well, and copies had to be made. What you read in Exodus 20 is a secondary version of the Ten Commandments because God allowed the originals to be destroyed. The point is that it doesn't matter if you have the originals or not, it matters if God's Word is perfectly inspired and preserved in that perfection by His own guidance.

**The Bible does NOT say that the originals are better than translations.**

> Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: -Colossians 1:12-13

> By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God. -Hebrews 11:5
As a Christian, if you are translated into the Kingdom of God, are you the same, better, or worse? According to the Bible, we are better, made perfect, through translation.

**According to Scripture, translations are better than the original.** Instead of having faith in the perfection of the Word, new-age version defenders (scribes) look to their own minds to judge God's Word, rather than letting God's Word judge them.

*It is better to trust in the LORD than to put confidence in man.* -Psalm 118:8

*Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.* -Colossians 2:8

The Lord God did NOT put emphasis on the originals. It is mankind that has put emphasis on the originals. Be careful not put your confidence in men, and trust in the promise of preservation.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pagan Manuscripts</th>
<th>Preserved Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 A.D.</td>
<td><strong>Alexandrian followers of Clement &amp; Origen</strong> create corrupt manuscripts of Antioch texts (e.g. Vaticanus ±, Sinaiticus ±) (300-200)</td>
<td><strong>Antioch Preserves Apostles’ Writings</strong> (1st-2nd Century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constantine attempts to usurp Church of Christ (i.e. Roman Catholicism) (326)</td>
<td>Copies of original texts from Antioch are translated and spread throughout Europe (2nd Century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome Bible created from Alexandrian (Origen) Manuscripts (380)</td>
<td>Antioch texts continue to be used, copied, and spread out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dark Ages**

| 500 A.D. | **Catholic popes begin suppression of knowledge of God’s Word; Using their corrupt translation, while destroying preserved Antioch Vulgate & murdering Christians for refusing pope’s authority** |
| 1000 A.D. | **Jerome Bible renamed ‘Latin Vulgate’ by pope Gregory IX, adopting vulgate title to deceive believers, and put into use by the Catholic church (1230-1240)** |
| 1100 | Laws created by the popes to ban ownership, and reading of, Bibles (13th century) |
| 1200 | **Vulgate spread out around the world, translating and copying fragmented pieces out of the sight of the Roman papacy; Dark Ages continue through 15th century** |
| 1300 | Erasmus compiles fragmented pieces and completes first edition of preserved Bible (1516) |
| 1400 | Tyndale continues revisions after Erasmus’ death (1535) |
| 1500 A.D. | King James Bible completed and sent to printers (1611) |
| 1600 | Font change, spelling changes, and 400 printing press errors are corrected, no textual changes were made (1769) |
| 1700 | King James Bible becomes bestselling and most-read singular book of all time, and continues to be spread out around the world |

**The entire source of Bible versions today can be traced back to two basic groups:** The Majority Texts (i.e. the true preserved Word of God) or the Minority Texts (i.e. corrupt alterations based on pagan philosophy). The Majority Texts (derived from Antioch) make up about 99% of all the available manuscripts we have to confirm the Bible, and the Minority Texts (derived from Alexandria) make up the other 1%. The Majority Texts were the preserved Word of God being copied and spread out around the world, while the Minority Texts were the corrupt pagan philosophy that was almost never copied, rarely read, and found on dusty bookshelves or trash bins.
Origen is praised among new-age scholars as one of the "early church fathers," but he denied the divinity of Jesus Christ as the true Living God in the flesh. From his teachings, the Alexandrian manuscripts, which removed the lordship and deity of Christ, were born.

"Origen... denied the deity of Christ, teaching that Jesus was a lesser, created god. He and other false teachers who did not confess the Lord Jesus Christ set to mutilating the Alexandrian group of manuscripts, 'editing,' omitting, and changing passages of Scripture. The Alexandrian texts underlying the modern Bible versions are based on these corrupted manuscripts."


"[Origen] believed that Jesus was only a created being and Gnosticism taught that Jesus became Christ at his baptism but that he was never God. He [Jesus] was a just a good man with very high morals."


Origen was a student of the humanistic philosophies of Aristotle, Plato, and Ammonius, and he altered the Bible to make God's Word say what he wanted it to say, although new-age version defenders seem to act as if no one ever lied to corrupt the Word of God.

"Origen, being the textual critic, is supposed to have corrected numerous portions of the sacred manuscripts. Evidence to the contrary shows that he changed them to agree with his human philosophy of mystical and allegorical ideas. Thus, through deceptive scholarship of this kind, certain manuscripts became corrupt."


Origen was also a student of Clement of Alexandria, who sought to combine Greek philosophy with Christianity, no different than many religions today trying to corrupt Christianity by combining it with pagan ideas.


Titus Clemens is considered a saint by the Catholic church, (and we should be cautious of anyone honored by Catholicism) but he denied the ultimate authority of our Lord Jesus Christ by labeling His Gospel as simply an improvement on pagan philosophers like Plato.

(See Titus Flavius Clemens [Alexandrinus], The Writings of Clement of Alexandria, T. & T. Clark, 1869, p. 14)

Though Jesus Christ said nothing in secret (John 18:20), Clement believed in "Secret Greater Mysteries," that should only be revealed to an elect few, which is how cults operate:

"Clement tells us that in early Christianity there were likewise Lesser Mysteries for beginners on the spiritual path and Greater Mysteries were a secret higher knowledge, which led to full 'initiation.' The secret traditions of true Gnosis,' he explains, has been transmitted 'to a small number, by a succession of masters, and not in writing.'"

2 -- Minority Texts

The following are common names used in reference to the minority texts:

- Alexandrian Texts
- Vaticanus (Codex) B
- Sinaiticus (Aleph)

Today, the number of the minority texts only totals at about 50. All the minority texts disagree with each other in thousands of places (which is why they are put in a separate category), and they make up less than 1% of the all manuscripts for the Bible discovered throughout the world.

3 -- Vaticanus (Codex) B

This text is considered by new-age version users to be the most authoritative of the minority texts.

- Dated 340-350 A.D.
  - 759 pages
  - 10 x 10.5 inch pages
  - 3 columns x 41 lines per page

After studying it carefully, the former Dean of Westminster said the following about Codex B:

"The impurity of the text exhibited by these codices is not a question of opinion, but fact... In the Gospels [New Testament] alone, Codex B (i.e. Vaticanus) leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 1,491 times. It bears traces of careless transcriptions on every page."

- John W. Burgon, quoted by Larry Alavezos, A Primer on Salvation and Bible Prophecy, TEACH Services Inc., 2010, p. 84-85, ISBN: 9781572586406

"Codex B differs from the commonly received Text of Scripture in the Gospels alone in 7578 places, of which no less than 2877 are instances of omission."


"It should be noted... that there is no prominent Biblical (manuscripts) in which there occur such gross cases of misspelling, faulty grammar, and omission, as in (Codex) B."


If it weren't for the deception of men trying to cover up the fatal flaws of the minority texts, these would be considered some of the most gross errors to ever be uncovered in manuscript evidence throughout history.

"[S]o manifest are the disfigurements jointly and exclusively exhibited by codices B and Aleph, that instead of accepting these codices as two 'independent' Witnesses to the inspired Original, we are constrained to regard them as little more than a single reproduction of one and the same scandalously corrupt and (comparatively) late Copy. By consequence, we consider their joint and exclusive attestation of any particular reading, 'an unique criterion' of its worthlessness; a sufficient reason, not for adopting, but for unceremoniously rejecting it."


4 -- Sinaiticus (Aleph)

This text is heavily relied upon by new-age version defenders.

- Dated 340-350 A.D.
  - 147.5 leaves
  - 15 x 13.5 inch pages
  - 4 columns x 48 lines per page
We already saw some serious faults with the Sinaiticus in the section above on the Vaticanus, but more specific to this document:

"The Codex is covered with such alterations... brought in by at least ten different revisors, some of them systematically spread over every page, others occasional or limited to separated portions of the manuscript, many of these being contemporaneous with the first writer, but for the greater part belonging to the sixth or seventh century."
-Dr. Frederick H. Scrivener, quoted in Johnson's Universal Cyclopaedia, published A.J. Johnson & Co., 1886, p. 135; See also David Fuller, True or False?, Grand Rapids International Publications, 1973, p. 74-75

There is clear evidence of many different edits of this document, bearing the language used around the 6th or 7th century. The only thing "original" about this document is the imagination of each person who changed it.

"From the number of omoioteleuta [Greek - 'loose words or phrases'] (p. 9) and other errors, one cannot affirm that it is very carefully written."
-Frederick H. A. Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, Oxford University, 1883, p. 90

Not only is it poorly written, but it gets stranger when we find out that a Catholic scribe claimed to have written the Sinaiticus himself in the 19th century:

"Constantine Simonides, a Greek of Syme, who had just edited a few papyrus fragments of the New Testament alleged to have been written in the first century of the Christian era (p. 24, note 2), astonished the learned world in 1862 by claiming to be himself the scribe who had penned this manuscript in the monastery of Panteleemon on Mouth Athos, as recently as in the years 1839 and 1840."
-Frederick H. A. Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, Oxford University, 1883, p. 91

5 -- Dark Ages

Though historians bicker amongst themselves, what really started (and maintained) the Dark Ages in Europe was the suppression of knowledge and persecution of the Inquisition by the Roman Catholic Church, and aside from trying to gain political dominance over the kings of the earth, the Catholic popes wanted supreme control over the reading of the Word of God, and out of the hands of the commoner. They wanted their own corrupted text to be exalted by all men, and in cultic fashion, force all illiterate commoners to come to the Catholic priests to be told what the Bible says and interpreted for them, instead of being able to read it themselves.

For example, the Catholic Council of Tarragona in 1234 A.D. decreed the following:

"No one may possess the books of the Old and New Testaments in the Romance language, and if anyone possesses them he must turn them over to the local bishop within eight days after promulgation of this decree, so that they may be burned lest, be he a cleric or a layman, he be suspected until he is cleared of all suspicion."

If readers of this article do not understand the violence and corruption of the Catholic Church, please click on this link to read our article: Corruptions of Christianity: Catholicism. In that article, we provide a lot more information on the origins of the Catholic church, and the doctrines they teach which lead people to hell.

Even the Bible itself was once a banned by the Catholic church, considering anyone who had a copy of the Word of God to be a traitor to Jesus Christ:
"The Vatican permitted scrutiny of one of the most notorious periods in Roman Catholic Church history yesterday when it opened the archives of the department once known as the Inquisition... Opened on Thursday alongside the Inquisition archives was the infamous Index of Forbidden Books, which Roman Catholics were forbidden to read or possess on pain of excommunication. They showed that even the Bible was once on the blacklist. Translations of the Holy Book ended up on the bonfires along with other 'heretical' works because the Church, whose official language was Latin, was suspicious of allowing the faithful access to sacred texts without ecclesiastical guidance."

- Stabroek News, "Vatican Archives Reveal Bible Was Once Banned Book," Friday, Jan 23, 1998, p. 10

Of course, the Catholics would not allow the common man to read the Bible when it says that we don't need the Catholic church to read the Bible for us:

But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him. -1 John 2:27

And those who would dare to read and study the Word of God were fully punished by the Catholic church:

"In 1244, their power was farther increased by the emperor Frederic the Second, who declared himself the protector and friend of all inquisitors, and published the cruel edicts, viz. 1. That all heretics who continued obstinate, should be burnt. 2. That all heretics who repented, should be imprisoned for life... The inquisition likewise takes cognizance of such as are accused of being magicians, and of such who read the bible in the common language... Upon all occasions the inquisitors carry on their processes with the utmost severity, and punish those who offend them with the most unparalleled cruelty."


This oppression led the way for the Catholic church to suppress all knowledge it did not first approve, and people it did not approve of, even doctors and scientists who were seeking to cure illnesses and disease. For example, many such illnesses and diseases could have been wiped out if people were simply taught to wash their hands, which God instructed Israel to do in the Old Testament, but since the Catholic church suppressed the reading of the Word of God, that information never reached the people.

6 -- Brooke F. Westcott

Brooke Westcott (1825-1901), an Anglican priest, was one of the two men who created the foundational Greek New Testament that all of today's modern new-age versions are translated from, told his daughter the following:

"No one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history - I could never understand how anyone reading them with open eyes could think they did."

-Brooke F. Westcott, letter to his eldest daughter E.G. King, May 10th, 1890; See also Arthur Westcott, Life and letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, Macmillan, Vol. 2, 1903, p. 69

Westcott does not believe that Genesis teaches a six-day creation, nor does he believe it teaches that man sinned and brought death into the world. These are foundational doctrines that if you remove them, then Jesus Christ's death on the cross meant nothing.

(Read "Is the Earth's Age a Doctrinal Issue?" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)
Westcott did not believe in a literal heaven; he believed heaven was on earth:

"We may reasonably hope, by patient, resolute, faithful, united endeavour to find heaven about us here, the glory of our earthly life."
-Brooke F. Westcott, sermon preached on July 20th, 1901; See also Arthur Westcott, Life and letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, Macmillan, Vol. 2, 1903, p. 394

He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it. -Matthew 10:39

Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. -1 John 2:15

Westcott also kept a dear love for the Catholic goddess "Mary," and sought to pay tribute to her:

"After leaving the monastery, we shaped our course to a little oratory which we discovered on the summit of a neighboring hill... Fortunately we found the door open. It is very small, with one kneeling-place, and behind a screen was a 'Pieta' the size of life (i.e., a Virgin and dead Christ)... Had I been alone, I could have knelt there for hours."
-Brooke F. Westcott, letter to his fiance, 1847; See also Arthur Westcott, Life and letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, Macmillan, Vol. 1, 1903, p. 81

Mariolatry is the study of worship of the pagan goddess of the Catholics, the Virgin Mary [Mary-olatry], and Westcott said:

'I wish I could see to what forgotten truth Mariolatry bears witness."

There are hundreds of these examples in the writings of Westcott, including his socialism, belief in purgatory, worship of idols, and much more. Westcott did not believe in the basic doctrines of God's Word, and his allegiance to the Roman Pontiff is very clear.

Hort did not believe in the infallible Word of God and wrote letters to friends telling them about his bizarre beliefs. He admitted to Rowland Williams that he did not believe in the authority of God's Word, and condemned evangelists for teaching it:

"Further I agree with them [Authors of "Essays and Reviews"] in condemning many leading specific doctrines of the popular theology... Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue. There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, and especially the authority of the Bible."

Hort believed in Darwinian evolution:

"The beginning of an individual is precisely as inconceivable as the beginning of a species...It certainly startles me to find you saying that you have seen no facts which support such as view as Darwin's... But it seems to me the most probable manner of development, and the reflexions suggested by his book drove me to the conclusion that some kind of development must be supposed,"

"Have you read Darwin? How I should like a talk with you about it! In spite of difficulties, I am inclined to think it unanswerable. In any case it is a treat to read such a book."
Hort believed in works-based doctrine that denies Jesus Christ:

"The fact is, I do not see how God's justice can be satisfied without every man's suffering in his own person the full penalty for his sins."
-Fenton J. A. Hort, letter to Rev. F. D. Maurice, Nov 16, 1849; See also Sir Arthur Hort, Life and letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, Macmillan, Vol. 1, 1896, p. 120

Hort also denied God's infallibility in His Word:

"But I am not able to go as far as you in asserting the absolute infallibility of a canonical writing." [i.e. Books of Old and New Testament]

There are hundreds of these examples in the writings of Hort, including his racism, belief in catholic doctrines and practices, and much more. When people turn to their new-age versions, they're turning to men [Westcott and Hort] who did not believe in the doctrines of Jesus Christ, and trust in these men to interpret God's Word.

8 -- Majority Texts

There are a large number of these manuscripts, and are commonly called:

- Textus Receptus [Received Text]
  - Antioch Texts
  - Traditional Texts
  - Syrian Texts
  - Byzantine Texts

Today, the majority texts total over 5,000 copies. The only differences between these manuscripts are the names of people, places, and other names like animals or stones. (e.g. Peter read Pedro in Spanish.) Outside of the names, all of these thousands of texts agree with each other because they were perfectly copied, but due to the efforts of the Roman Catholic Church to destroy the Word of God, many copies were burned and destroy, leaving behind many fragments that had to be pieced back together.

9 -- Desiderius Erasmus

Erasmus (1466-1536) is considered to be the first in a line of people who would work through the extremely difficult and time-consuming process of piecing together the majority text. Although the Roman Catholic Church banned such works, condemning people as heretics for reading the Word of God, Erasmus worked from within the borders of the Catholic church to accomplish his goal of getting the true Word of God into the hands of the common man and woman.

To gain an understanding of the task Erasmus was trying to complete, let's say I gave you a project to piece together a 10,000-piece puzzle, and though you know it's supposed to reveal a picture, you do not have the box cover to know what it is supposed to look like when it's done. I also threw in another 10,000 pieces from other random puzzles, so now you not only have to figure out the puzzle, but you have to figure out which pieces are not part of the puzzle you're trying to complete.

Most people label Erasmus as a "Catholic Priest" because he was a monk within the Roman Catholic Church, but he was no Catholic. Being born the son of a Catholic priest, Erasmus eventually chose to become an Augustinian, a group that, at the time, had the best libraries and resources in the known world, but he refused many of their worldly traditions, such as their pagan holidays and meatless Fridays. Erasmus used the Catholic resources to get his work done in compiling the true Word of God, because he knew that Jerome's Latin Vulgate was a corruption, and additionally wrote heavily against the wickedness of the papacy and false doctrines of Rome.
"[Erasmus] berated the papacy, the priesthood and the monks for their over-indulgences. He stated that the monks would not touch money, but that they were not so scrupulous concerning wine and women. He constantly attacked clerical concubinage and the cruelty with which the Roman Catholic Church dealt with so-called 'heretics'... One of his many writings consisted of a tract entitled 'Against the Barbarians,' which was directed against the overt wickedness of the Roman Catholic Church."

"This monarchy of the Roman pontiff is the pest of Christendom...”

Erasmus even compared pope Julius's Crusade to the warmongering of Julius Caesar:

"How truly is Julius playing the part of Julius."

Erasmus also describes the Pope being unable to enter the Kingdom of Heaven:

"And in the deepest secrecy... writing the masterly satire, entitled 'Julius exclusus', in which the Pope appears in all his glory before the gate of the Heavenly Paradise to plead his cause and find himself excluded."

Erasmus believe the Word of God should be for the common man, not the powerful and wealthy:

"Do you think that the Scriptures are fit only for the perfumed?"

Yet, mainstream history texts refer to Erasmus as a "good Catholic," because now that the common man has a Bible to study and read, the Catholic church wants to take credit for the very thing they fought (and still fight) against. In fact, it was the Catholic church that banned the reading of Erasmus, 23 years after he died:

"By midcentury, Catholic authorities cited Erasmus's writings as the inspiration of the Reformation, and in 1559, Pope Paul IV banned them all... Catholic scholars still today present Erasmus as vacillating between the confessions."

The Catholic church is trying to claim that Erasmus was riding the fence because he was confused. It's a pathetic excuse to hide their guilt of persecuting born-again Christians and destroying copies of God's preserved Word.

10 -- The 1769 Revision of the King James Bible

It would be better put that the 1769 edition of the King James Bible was a finalization of the book, rather than a revision or edition. When a new-age version comes out with a new "revision," they make all sorts of changes to words, adding and removing whatever they please, but this is NOT what was done in 1769.

The 1769 revision of the King James Bible had no changes in doctrine or translation at all. It fixed things like font (for easier reading), printing press errors (not translation errors), italics (so the read can view which words were added by the King James translators for understanding context), and a few other minor details. Many KJB users put far too much emphasis on the 1611, when it is the 1769 that finalized the preserved Word of God.
(To learn about all these changes, read "KJB: 1611 or 1769?" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)
Now that we have seen the origins of the new-age bible versions, and with the knowledge that the minority texts were authored by men who did not believe on the Lord Jesus Christ in the first place, let's take a look at some examples of what has been changed by these unbelievers:

Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. -Matthew 6:9-13

Most church-going people are familiar with the Lord's Prayer. However, the new-age versions of the Bible have removed very important parts of this prayer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New International Version (NIV)</th>
<th>Removes: &quot;For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Living Translation (NLT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Standard Version (ASV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, when someone translates from corrupt pagan manuscripts, the lordship, divinity, and authority of Jesus Christ and His Gospel will be slowly removed. For example, the virgin birth is an important prophecy in the birth of the Messiah, but the new-age versions seek to remove the virgin birth:

And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS. -Matthew 1:25

If Jesus isn't the firstborn, then He doesn't fulfill the prophecy of virgin birth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New International Version (NIV)</th>
<th>Removes: &quot;firstborn&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New American Standard (NASV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version (ESV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Bible, "begat" means the father brought forth the son through the woman. Many sons have been adopted or taken in by a family, but to begat a son means he came from the father. Some new-age versions seek to remove the begotten Son of God:

And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth. -John 1:14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New International Version (NIV)</th>
<th>Removes: &quot;begotten&quot; (other scriptures omit &quot;begotten Son&quot;) See also John 1:18, 3:16, 3:18, Acts 13:33, Hebrews 5:5, 1 John 4:9, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version (ESV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, this one is extremely important because many new-age versions replace "begotten" son with "one and only" son, which actually makes the Bible wrong. In Luke, Adam is also called a son of god:

Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God. -Luke 3:38
Adam was created, but only Jesus Christ was *begotten* by the Lord God because Jesus Christ is God. To write "one and only son" makes it wrong, but most new-age versions do this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized King James (KJB)</th>
<th>(and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only <em>begotten of the Father.</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New International Version (NIV)</td>
<td>&quot;We have seen his glory, the glory of the <em>one and only</em> Son,&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holman Christian Standard Version</td>
<td>&quot;We observed His glory, the glory as the <em>One and Only</em> Son from the Father&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version (ESV)</td>
<td>&quot;we have seen his glory, glory as of the <em>only Son</em> from the Father&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td>&quot;we have beheld his glory, glory as of the <em>only Son</em> from the Father&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Living Translation (NLT)</td>
<td>&quot;we have seen his glory, the glory of the Father’s <em>one and only</em> Son.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men commanded to live by the Word of God is removed from *Luke 4:4*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized King James (KJB)</th>
<th>And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New International Version (NIV)</td>
<td>&quot;It is written: 'Man does not live on bread alone.'&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Standard (NASV)</td>
<td>&quot;It is written, 'MAN SHALL NOT LIVE ON BREAD ALONE.'&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version (ESV)</td>
<td>&quot;It is written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone.'&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td>&quot;It is written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone.'&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Standard Version (ASV)</td>
<td>It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Lord Jesus Christ is removed from *Ephesians 3:14*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized King James (KJB)</th>
<th>For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New International Version (NIV)</td>
<td>For this reason I kneel before the Father,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Standard (NASV)</td>
<td>For this reason I bow my knees before the Father,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version (ESV)</td>
<td>For this reason I bow my knees before the Father,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td>For this reason I bow my knees before the Father,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Standard Version (ASV)</td>
<td>For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christ also removed from *1 Timothy 2:7*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized King James (KJB)</th>
<th>(I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New International Version (NIV)</td>
<td>--I am telling the truth, I am not lying--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Standard (NASV)</td>
<td>(I am telling the truth, I am not lying)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version (ESV)</td>
<td>(I am telling the truth, I am not lying)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td>(I am telling the truth, I am not lying)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Standard Version (ASV)</td>
<td>(I speak the truth, I lie not)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christ’s blood is removed from *Colossians 1:14*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorized King James (KJB)</th>
<th>In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New International Version (NIV)</td>
<td>in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Standard (NASV)</td>
<td>in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version (ESV)</td>
<td>in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td>in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Standard Version (ASV)</td>
<td>in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Belief on Christ is removed from **John 6:47**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Authorized King James (KJB)</strong></th>
<th>Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New International Version (NIV)</td>
<td>...he who believes has everlasting life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Standard (NASV)</td>
<td>...he who believes has eternal life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version (ESV)</td>
<td>...whoever believes has eternal life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td>...he who believes has eternal life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Standard Version (ASV)</td>
<td>...He that believeth hath eternal life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Repentance is removed **Mark 2:17**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Authorized King James (KJB)</strong></th>
<th>When Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New International Version (NIV)</td>
<td>...I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Standard (NASV)</td>
<td>...I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version (ESV)</td>
<td>...I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td>...I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Standard Version (ASV)</td>
<td>...I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Read "Is Repentance Necessary?" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)

Christ's Salvation is removed from **Luke 9:56**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Authorized King James (KJB)</strong></th>
<th>For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New International Version (NIV)</td>
<td>and they went to another village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Standard (NASV)</td>
<td>[NASB puts above highlighted portion in brackets as a footnote] And they went on to another village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version (ESV)</td>
<td>And they went on to another village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td>And they went on to another village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Standard Version (ASV)</td>
<td>And they went to another village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are **literally thousands of examples like this** through all the different versions, but let's use the New International Version as an example for a moment. There are over 200 omitted verses in this new-age version. If you have access to an NIV, check and see if you can find the following verses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NIV Removes</th>
<th>Subject Matter Omitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 17:21, 18:11</td>
<td>Prayer, Fasting, Savior of sinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 9:44, 9:46, 11:26, 15:28</td>
<td>Emphasis on the fires of Hell, God's warning on forgiveness, Fulfillment of messianic prophecies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:36, 23:17</td>
<td>Details of the return of the 2nd coming of Christ, Explanations of the laws of the land in that day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 5:4</td>
<td>Bethesda's pool of healing by the angel of God (contextual requirement to understand the chapter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 8:37, 24:7</td>
<td>Jesus Christ is the Son of God, Capturing of Paul by Lysias (contextual requirement to understand the chapter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you are a reader that uses a new-age version, you might say that your version may not contain some of these omissions, but remember the chart that was displayed earlier. **All the new-age versions come from the same corrupted source!** When you read these verses in the King James Bible, you can see where major doctrines in the Gospel of Jesus Christ are left out of the main text of these "modernized" versions.

**What About The New King James?**

There are many people still looking to make a compromise in their Bibles by getting a NEW King James, instead of the Authorized King James. The one thing we have to understand about lies is that the closer they are to the truth, the more deceptive they become.

First, the NKJV users need to understand that the large amount of footnotes the NKJV contains are taken directly from Westcott & Hort's Greek New Testament, the same source that all the new-age versions are built from, which comes from the minority pagan manuscripts authored by people who didn't believe in the principle doctrines of Christ. There's no reason we need to add footnotes to God's Word that were authored by wicked men who are honored by the Roman Catholic Church.

And second, when we look into the NKJV, we'll see the changes it has made which corrupt the Word of God. I have some experience looking at the NKJV because I used one for many years before I switched to a KJB, so let's take a look at some serious problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But this I confess to you, that according to the Way which they call a sect, so I worship the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law and in the Prophets.</td>
<td>But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this was Paul's defense of lies made against him, the NKJV downgrades a heresy, which are lies and false doctrines that work iniquity against Jesus Christ, to a "sect," which would be considered a branch in a religious tree. (With this, the NKJV removes all instances of the word "heresy.") Is Catholicism heresy, or is it a sect? Is Mormonism heresy, or is it a sect? Changing heresy to mean a sect is one of many reasons why the new-age church (using their new-age versions) foolishly accept all sorts of heresies as a "sect" of Christianity.

When we read books, our vocabulary increases, and we speak/write words out of the vocabulary base we have gained through reading, which means whatever it is you study, you will use similar vocabulary from those studies. When a specific term is removed from the doctrine of the Bible, then when we speak/write about doctrine, we will not be able to teach properly because we don't have the proper terms to understand the teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>who by the mouth of Your servant David have said: Why did the nations rage, And the people plot vain things?</td>
<td>Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**heathen (n): a pagan; a Gentile; one who worships idols, or is unacquainted with the true God**

(See 'heathen'. American Dictionary of the English Language, Noah Webster, 1828, retrieved Oct 24, 2014 [webstersdictionary1828.com])
This is a very important distinction because today, most new-age church buildings celebrate all sorts of pagan, idolatrous witchcraft rituals, like Halloween, Christmas, and Easter. Using the word "heathen," God's Word specifically points out that it is a pagan people who rage against God, and that we are to turn from our idols.

_Ye know that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led._ -1 Corinthians 12:2

_For they themselves shew of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God._ -1 Thessalonians 1:9

_Little children, keep yourselves from idols. Amen._ -1 John 5:21

But those who study their NKJV will be softer on paganism because as the terms are removed that point towards the wickedness of pagan holidays and rituals, so too will the Christians be ignorant of Satan's devices in the holidays they celebrate.

In fact, the NKJV users will be so blinded to the truth of the heathen, they'll even miss the pagan symbols that come with it. The following image is a scan I did on the NKJV I used to read as an early Christian.

(The 666 is theoretical. There is, so far, no documented evidence of this connection, but if we stay away from symbols altogether, there's no risk of demonic connections at all.)

The explanation for this symbol, called the "triquetra," is to claim it represents the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the Trinity:

"The Triquetra... is an early Church symbol of the Trinity and is often found on many editions of the New King James Version of the Bible."

There are many mainstream "Christian" sources that claim this symbol is justified, but first, let's see what the Bible says about these symbols:

_Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device. And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent._ -Acts 17:29-30

We are commanded to repent of believing that graven symbols represent God. Therefore, anyone who is attempting to justify this symbol is not standing on Biblical foundation.

"In Christian Ireland and other areas, the triquetra was used to represent the Holy Trinity, but the symbol itself far predates Christianity... it has also been found as a symbol of Odin in the Nordic lands."
We discuss the connection between Odin and the pagan Christmas holiday in another article. Odin is the pagan god by whom witches believe brought magical power to the earth through runic languages.

"Also known as a 'trinity knot,' the triquetra is formed from interlocked vesica pisces, marking the intersection of three circles. It has been found on runestones in Northern Europe and on early Germanic coins. It is similar to the valknut, a symbol associated with Odin... Modern Wicca and neo-pagan groups use the symbol for a variety of concepts and mythological figures."


The reason they put that symbol on the front of a "Book of Shadows" is because of the aforementioned witches' belief that Odin brought magic into the world.

(Read "Christian Symbols Are Not Christian" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)

"The beginnings of symbolistic thought date to the late Paleolithic Age, [i.e. religious evolution propaganda -- showing how paganism and evolutionism fit easily into one another] when nomadic hunter/gatherer societies expressed their magic or supernatural beliefs in rock carvings and paintings. As civilization developed, symbols became integral to MAGIC, ALCHEMY, and all esoteric teachings for they contain secret wisdom accessible only to the initiated. In all mystical, magical, and religious traditions, symbols play an important role in the alteration and transformation of consciousness."


This symbolism is used in witch chants by those who believe exactly what this pagan encyclopedia just told us. In a shamanistic ceremony, after doing a number of exercises of visualization and breathing techniques, the author instructs the practitioners:

"If your eyes are closed, open them. With your power hand, trace a shining triquetra of light before you, saying: 'By land, by sky, by sea...' Hold your hands out, as if channeling more light into the symbol, and chant: 'By the ancient trinity...' Open your arms to enfold and embrace the triquetra into your body and being, and, as you physically move your hands back to your heart and absorb the power of this conjured light, say, 'All three realms align within me.'"

-Gede Parma, Ecstatic Witchcraft: Magick, Philosophy & Trance in the Shamanic Craft, Llewellyn Worldwide, 2012, p. 37, ISBN: 9780738733777; Parma is a witch, international teacher of new initiates into shamanistic craft, and claims to be a devotee of Kali Maa and Persephone.

The only reason that symbol would be attributed to Christianity is due to the efforts of the Catholic church to merge paganism into their bloody religion. This symbol was added by people ignoring the warnings about witchcraft and idolatry in the Bible, and choose to remain willingly ignorant of God's rebuke.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of our fathers, glorified His Servant Jesus, whom you delivered up and denied in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let Him go.</td>
<td>The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That Christ is the Son of God is vitally important to the doctrine of Salvation, whereas if He's just a servant, then it would correlate with other cult doctrines, like how the Jehovah's Witnesses believe that Jesus Christ was just an angel of God, but not actually His son.

(Read "Corruptions of Christianity: Jehovah's Witnesses - Who is Jesus Christ?" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)
*But I say to you that whoever divorces his wife for any reason except sexual immorality causes her to commit adultery; and whoever marries a woman who is divorced commits adultery.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NKJV - Mat 5:32</th>
<th>KJB - Mat 5:32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fornication is very specific, as it refers to sexual intercourse outside of marriage, but "sexual immorality" is open-ended to the reader's personal interpretation because it is not specific. Therefore, readers get the impression that sex outside of marriage is acceptable to God, so long as you're not "immoral" about it.

The New King James Version authors claimed in their preface that they intended to create a Bible in English text "*that is both accurate and readable,*" and that they have "*sought to maintain those lyrical and devotional qualities that are so highly regarded in the Authorized Version.*" In other words, they claim it's the KJB, but just updated to a more understandable modern English, but what they don't tell you is the following:

- **The NKJV omits "Lord" from God and Jesus in their text at least 66 times.**
- **The NKJV omits "God" from their text at least 51 times.**
- **The NKJV omits "heaven" from their text at least 50 times.**
- **The NKJV omits "repent" from their text at least 44 times.**

There are hundreds of examples like this we could provide for the corruption in the NKJV, but the point should be clear by now. The closer something is to the truth, the more deceptive it becomes. Though the NKJV has not removed all instances of 'Lord' or 'God' from their text, the fact of the matter is that it is watered-down, and thus your faith will also be watered-down, because your faith is built through the Word of God.

*So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.*

> Romans 10:17

*I tell you that he will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?*  
> Luke 18:8

---

### Contradictions in New-Age Versions

As we just demonstrated, the God's Word is perfect and pure, so if we find a Bible with one error, it cannot be God's Word. This makes it very easy research because all we have to do is read a version until we find an error, then throw it out, and compare all versions on that error until we narrow it down.

#### Easter or Passover?

"*The word 'Easter' is only found in one scripture in the entire King James Bible. Other translations have thankfully corrected this mistake.*"


"*Another obvious mistake made by the KJV translators occurs in Acts 12:4. The word 'Easter' is used.*"


William Tyndale (1494-1536) is the man given credit with coining the English word "Passover," because there was no single-word English equivalent at the time for the Hebrew holiday, and the Tyndale Bible, like the KJB, still uses the word "Easter" in Acts 12:4.

**TYNDALE BIBLE:** "And when he had caught him he put him in preson and delyvered him to .iii. quaternion of soudiers to be kepte entdenyng after ester to brynge him forth to the people."
You'll commonly find those in "modern scholarship" (i.e. new-age version defenders) claiming the KJB is wrong in it's use of Easter. I'm going to show Christians how God's Word proves the proper translation in Acts 12:4 is NOT Passover, and new-age versions got it wrong.

In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread, until the one and twentieth day of the month at even. -Exodus 12:18

In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the LORD'S passover. -Leviticus 23:5

According to Scripture, the Jews were to kill a lamb and eat it on the celebration day (which Tyndale named) Passover (Nisan [Jewish Calendar] 14th-21st). For a full week after that, they were supposed to eat unleavened bread, and the week FOLLOWING Passover, is called the days of unleavened bread.

Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses: for whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel. -Exodus 12:15

The 14th of Nisan is "Passover," and the 15th-21st is "the feast of unleavened bread." The Bible clearly makes a distinction between the day of passover, and the days of unleavened bread. This is also contextual subject matter one must understand to see what Paul was talking about in 1Cr 5:

Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleaven bread of sincerity and truth. -1 Corinthians 5:7-8

This is not saying that we are to observe days and times (Gal 4:9-11), but that the Passover celebration was completed in Christ, and that we should purge out wickedness and iniquity from His Church. With Christ, the Passover is finished, and now we are to be unleavened in Him, this dispensation being a representation of the feast of unleavened bread.

And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the LORD: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread. -Leviticus 23:6

Of course, the new-age version user might come back and say "Aha! (Psa 40:15) It says seven days! And the 21-15 = 6! Therefore you're wrong!" In subtraction, we get a number distance from two different numbers, but when counting to six, people often forget to count from zero.

If a child is playing hide-and-seek, and they are going to count to ten, they typically start by counting "1," but the problem is that he/she skipped zero to one, so technically, the child only counted to nine, not to ten. When we count material objects, like apples or the fingers on your hand, the number represents a singular object, which means the object is represented directly by the number, but when dealing with time (i.e. seconds or calendar days), it is represented by the equidistance between each number.

So we have eight days represented for this feast, the first day being Passover, and the following seven days being the days of unleavened bread. Now that we have proper contextual knowledge from God's Word, let's go back and analyze Acts 12:4 once more:
Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword. And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also. (Then were the days of unleavened bread.) [i.e. Passover had already passed.] And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people. -Acts 12:1-4

The King James Bible is the only one that got it right. The new-age versions made it wrong:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New International Version (NIV)</td>
<td>&quot;Herod intended to bring him out for public trial after the Passover.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Living Translation (NLT)</td>
<td>&quot;Herod's intention was to bring Peter out for public trial after the Passover.&quot; (The NLT also edits verse 3 to try and fix this error.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version (ESV)</td>
<td>&quot;...intending after the Passover to bring him out to the people.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New King James Version (NKJV)</td>
<td>&quot;...intending to bring him before the people after Passover.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Standard Version (NASV)</td>
<td>&quot;...intending after the Passover to bring him out before the people.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td>&quot;...intending after the Passover to bring him out before the people.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Standard Version (ASV)</td>
<td>&quot;...intending after the Passover to bring him forth to the people.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Herod were to wait until after Passover, as the new-age versions have inserted, then he would have waited another full year. That makes no contextual sense because the Jews wanted him dead right then and there; however, there was a celebration going on at the same time that was a big party in the Roman Empire, and that was the Easter celebration (or the equivalent of what they called the celebration of Ishtar at the time). Herod didn't want to have to do work, and have his officers do a bunch of work, to interrupt their fun time pagan festival, so he waited until after Easter was over to appease the Jews.

It also doesn't make sense for Herod to put sixteen soldiers (four quaternions) to guard over one prison cell for an entire year. The only way this makes sense in the context of the Bible was if the celebration that was recorded here was the "Easter" celebration of the pagans in the Roman Empire.

You may run into some church-going that will try to lie to you and tell you that the entire 8-day celebration was Passover, and not one day. If you see someone make that argument, ask them to show it to you in Scripture, so you can catch them in their lie because the Bible specifically points out that the Passover celebration is labeled as one day, and the days of unleavened bread is labeled separately.

And they departed from Rameses in the first month, on the fifteenth day of the first month; on the morrow after the passover the children of Israel went out with an high hand in the sight of all the Egyptians. -Numbers 33:3

And they did eat of the old corn of the land on the morrow after the passover, unleavened cakes, and parched corn in the selfsame day. -Joshua 5:11

It doesn't matter how many Christians want to try to argue with you that the word pascha means "passover," but that is NOT the proper translation in Acts 12:4, and the context of Scripture proves it. (i.e. God's Word says "passover" is wrong in Acts 12:4.)
The word *pascha* is used in Scripture 29 times, and of those 29, 28 are used for "passover," and only once for Easter, and many new-agers want to condemn the King James Bible over that point, but I want to point out that there is no Greek-equivalent word for Easter! Rome was celebrating their feasts at the same time the Jews were celebrating theirs, and when writing this down in Greek, there was no other word to use for that celebration at the time, except *pascha*, because the word "passover" will not have been invented for another 1500 years, and the word "Easter" will not be applied to the Roman celebration for a long time afterward.

The new-age scoffer will ignore you if you say this, repeating that *pascha* is NOT the Greek word for Easter. So ask them: What is the Greek word for Easter then? They can't give you an answer because there isn't one.

To further demonstrate this point to those of you who want to learn the truth about this, and how many websites and books out there lie to people to say that pascha is not used as a word for Easter, I got to thinking that the Easter celebration is such a world-wide event, surely the Greeks must have some word they use for it. So I went to lexilogos.com, which has a translator from English to Greek, and I decided to enter in the title of this article “Easter: Christians Celebrating Abomination,” and let it translate the phrase, which you can see if you click this link: [https://translate.google.com/?hl=en#en/el/Easter%3A%20Christians%20Celebrating%20Abomination](https://translate.google.com/?hl=en#en/el/Easter%3A%20Christians%20Celebrating%20Abomination)

If you click the link and read how it came out, **you should notice the word Πασχά is used for "Easter." Πασχά is Pascha.** Despite what your Greek grammar dictionary says, **when a Greek-speaking person wants to say "Easter," they use the word pascha.**

(Read "The 'Original Greek' Scam" here at creationliberty.com for more details on why Christians should not rely on Greek grammar dictionaries and lexicons to interpret the Bible for them.)

Thus God has perfectly preserved His Word in the English for us. **The new-age versions, by covering up Easter, are hiding the fact that Easter was a pagan celebration of the heathen, and it helps keep Christians ignorant of the truth.**

Those who use a Geneva Bible have also written us in attempt to attack the KJB on this issue. William Tyndale (aforementioned) influenced about 80% of the Geneva Bible, but those who worked on the GB chose to change the word "Easter" to "Passover."

**GENEVA BIBLE:** "And when he had caught him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to be kept, intending after the Passover to bring him forth to the people."

GB-users believe Passover to be correct despite the direct Scriptural contradiction. To put it bluntly, the Geneva Bible is **WRONG** in Acts 12:4, and this why I tell GB-users that they ought to get a KJB.

It should be noted that the removal of "Easter" in Acts 12 also removes the Biblical evidence that Easter is a corrupt pagan holiday honoring false gods, and not something holy of the Lord. The Catholic church, along with a surprising number of modern day Christians, are attempting to use Jesus Christ as an excuse for abominable pagan practices.

(Read "Easter: Christians Celebrating Abomination" here at creationliberty.com for more details on the Easter celebration and the witchcraft involved.)

---

**How Long is the Creation Week?**

*For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day:*

*Exodus 20:11*

These verses all correlate together that the Lord God created the universe, along with the earth and all its inhabitants, in six 24-hour days just like we experience today. However, the new-age versions have done a lot of cutting and pasting to help keep the meaning of Genesis 1 vague, and open to personal interpretation.

(Read "Is the Earth's Age a Doctrinal Issue?" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)
This phrase is very significant because it points out "THE" first day, along with the evening and morning. If we were sitting in a car in highway traffic (you were at the driver's wheel) and I said "look at a car," you may be confused because you're looking at many cars, but if I said, "look at THE car," you would look around for a specific car, or even look for me to point one out because you know with my usage of the word THE, there is a specific, unique object I'm pointing out.

Likewise, to the example of the car, pointing out THE first day is significant in it being the beginning of all days, but if God were just to say "one day," then the significance is gone, and it could mean any day at any time, being left open to interpret however one personally pleases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New International Version (NIV)</td>
<td>God called the light &quot;day,&quot; and the darkness he called &quot;night.&quot; And there was evening, and there was morning. The first day.</td>
<td>&quot;Day&quot; and &quot;night&quot; in quotations, suggesting they are not literal 24-hour days. Removes THE from evening and morning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Living Translation (NLT)</td>
<td>God called the light &quot;day&quot; and the darkness &quot;night.&quot; Together these made up one day.</td>
<td>&quot;Day&quot; and &quot;night&quot; in quotations. Removes evening and morning; &quot;the first&quot; day replaced with &quot;one&quot; day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version (ESV)</td>
<td>God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And there was evening and there was morning, the first day.</td>
<td>Removes THE from evening and morning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Standard Version (NASV)</td>
<td>God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day.</td>
<td>Removes THE from evening and morning; replaces &quot;the first&quot; day with &quot;one&quot; day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Standard Version (RSV)</td>
<td>God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day.</td>
<td>Removes THE from evening and morning; replaces &quot;the first&quot; day with &quot;one&quot; day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Standard Version (ASV)</td>
<td>And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day.</td>
<td>Removes THE from evening and morning; replaces &quot;the first&quot; day with &quot;one&quot; day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those of you who don't think this makes any difference, go search for websites of those who believe in the gap theory or day-age theory of creation; you'll be hard-pressed to find one that uses a King James Bible, and this is due to the fact that they can't interpret the billions of years of evolution from it because the KJB is not vague enough for them. For example, Richard Deem claims to be a Christian, but believes in the "Day-Age" theory, meaning that he believes in the billions of years of evolution and tries to mix them into the Bible:

"I believe in what has been called the "day-age" interpretation of Genesis one - that is, that each "day" is actually a long period of time during which God created life."


The above author uses the New American Standard Version, which removed "the" from evening and morning, and replaces "the first day" with "one day." It is quite common to find those who teach heretical doctrine using a new-age version.
Who is the Morning Star?

Jesus Christ directly tells us that He is the "morning star."

*I Jesus... I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.* -Revelation 22:16

Lucifer (Satan) is the "son of the morning."

*How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!* -Isaiah 14:12

However, some of the new-age versions have given the title of the Lord Jesus Christ (morning star) to Satan in Isaiah 14, which makes it seem that Jesus Christ is a fallen angel!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New International Version (NIV)</th>
<th><em>How you have fallen from heaven, O morning star,</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New American Standard Version (NASV)</td>
<td><em>How you have fallen from heaven, O star of the morning,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good News Bible (GNB)</td>
<td>King of Babylon, bright morning star, you have fallen from heaven!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New English Bible (NEB)</td>
<td>Look how you have fallen from the sky, O shining one, son of the dawn! [footnote says: 'a name for the morning star']</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How is it that you can put your trust into a book that interchangeably uses the names of Christ and Satan? Further still, Isaiah 14:12 is the only place in the Bible where Satan's name, Lucifer, is mentioned, but new-age versions, like the NLT, NIV, ESV, and many others, remove his name completely.

The NIV also teaches in 2Pe 1:19 that Satan would rise in our hearts at the words of the prophets:
"We also have the prophetic message as something completely reliable, and you will do well to pay attention to it, as to a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts."

There are many more contradictions beyond these few listed here, but if we call the Bible "the Word of God," then we are attributing error and contradiction to the Christian God of the Bible, which is a heresy in itself. If we don't want to blame God for contradictions and errors, then we should throw out these toy "bibles" and get a real Bible that contains no contradictions or errors.

Presuppositional Apologetics Requires The KJB

Presuppositional Apologetics is a method of preaching to atheists by demonstrating to them that knowledge in general (e.g. logic, science, mathematics) cannot exist without the Christian God of the Bible. Though many presuppositional apologists (PA's) will be upset by this, our feelings are irrelevant to the subject because without a pure and perfect Word of God, the entire foundation of PA falls on its face.

(Read "How to Talk with Atheists" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)

When a Christian PA claims the presupposition that there is an Almighty God who created logic and our brains to function according to the logical laws, it begs the question where this presupposition came from. Obviously, it comes from the Christian God of the Bible, which we presuppose by faith in His Word (the Bible), and that God cannot lie nor contradict Himself (perfection), and since God cannot contradict Himself, and He is the standard for logic and morals, then we are in error if we contradict ourselves.
This is a solid argument that atheists are unable to overcome because in order to argue for logic without the Christian God of the Bible, they must justify that logic, reason, morality, knowledge exist in an atheist universe, which they cannot do. However, that leaves us with a serious problem: If we have a Bible that has a contradiction, then our presupposition is no better than the atheist in that it falls flat on its face before it takes a second step. Which means in order to presuppose the perfection of the Christian God of the Bible, you must have a perfect Bible, and if you don't, then you are in the same fallacious position as the atheist.

*God is not a man, that he should lie;* -Numbers 23:19

If someone is giving a testimony in a court of law, and he has an affidavit (written testimony) saying he saw a man with a gun walk into a bank, but then in his verbal testimony on the witness stand, he says he did NOT see a man with a gun walk into a bank, he would be charged with perjury. One of the two testimonies is a lie because they directly contradict one another, so if there is any contradiction in God's Word, then that makes God a liar.

*In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began;* -Titus 1:2

If PA is quoting from a new-age version that contradicts itself, then he also contradicts himself, because he is claiming that the God he presupposes to be perfect and without contradiction, reads from a Bible that is imperfect and has contradiction. An example of this can be seen in a popular PA by the named of Sye Tenbruggencate.

In personal email correspondence, Sye wrote me the following:

"When I saw your video, I saw that you held to the KJVO only position and was immediately disappointed that you held a position that I feel is quackery, bordering on lunacy."

-Sye Tenbruggencate, email to Christopher Johnson, Dec 6, 2010, letter in author's archives

Even though Sye never defined in his letter what he meant by "KJVO only position," we at CLE only use the King James Bible, but we do not condemn people to hell for using new-age versions. We simply tell them that they're using watered-down versions that have omissions and contradictions in them, and they ought to get a copy of the perfect preserved Word of God in the King James Bible.

Sye continues:

"I have come to the conclusion that the KJVO position is a psychological position, and not a logical one. One cannot reason a person out of a position that they did not reason themselves into."

-Sye Tenbruggencate, email to Christopher Johnson, Dec 6, 2010, letter in author's archives

It is then safe to say that *Sye believes that anyone who would use the King James Bible, and expose the heresies and contradictions in the new-age versions, are unreasonable, psychologically disturbed quacks that are borderline lunatics*. Yet, Sye uses and quotes from an NIV on his website, and in his debates. So Sye presupposes the perfect and Holy God of the Bible, while holding up an NIV that calls Satan by the names used for Jesus Christ (as we mentioned in the previous section). This is what we call a contradiction; speaking of a perfect God that cannot contradict Himself, then turning around and studying a new-age version you call a "bible," that demonstrates imperfection and contradiction.

*These things hast thou done, and I kept silence; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself: but I will reprove thee, and set them in order before thine eyes.* -Psalm 50:21

*Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him.* -Proverbs 30:5

*Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.* -Matthew 5:48
The first step of the PA is to get the atheist to a point where he/she realizes the folly of not having a foundation for any kind of knowledge. The next step is to get them to acknowledge the Christian God of the Bible as a necessity to justify logic and reason, and hopefully bring them to repentance, but the problem is if they have a Bible that claims the Word of God is pure and perfect, but doesn't actually contain that purity and perfection, then they'll see the clear contradiction, which will lead them to believe that Christianity is a lie.

A Christian testimony about how the NIV almost turned him away from Christ:

"At first, I thought all Bible versions were the same except that the English was just different. Until one day when my muslim friend questioned me regarding the infallibility of the Bible. He had his facts from Muslim debaters like Ahmed Deedat and so on and what he brought up really scared me. He showed me so many contradictions in the NIV alone and even questioned me on the missing verses and some figures that were inaccurate. I did not know how to answer him as I haven't been taught these things before.

I tried asking my church members but all they could tell me was we have so many manuscripts and it was up to the so and so church council to decide which manuscripts should be put in. My muslim friend even questioned me on the footnotes in my NIV and why is it says some manuscripts have this verse and some manuscripts have that verse. I really didn't know what to do. I even began to have my doubts on whether the Bible is truly the word of God since all these versions contradict each other."


Let's look at some of the absurdity in the NIV to get a better understanding:

Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth? This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be. And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the cross ceased. I would they were even cut off which trouble you. -Galatians 5:7-12

In this context, cut off is referring to sanctification, or being set apart. Cutting off someone means that they are taken out of your presence so that they don't trouble you anymore, for example:

Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses: for whosoever eateth that which is leavened, even that soul shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel, whether he be a stranger, or born in the land. -Exodus 12:19

More specifically, the cutting off is setting apart those who would come to the born-again Christians and hinder them by trying to tell them lies so, to attempt to keep the Christian from obeying the truth of the word. It's just like you would cut off a lump of leaven from the rest of the bread. (i.e. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.")

Atheists are a wonderful example of those who are hindering Christians, trying to get them away from the truth of the word, and therefore, Paul is saying he wishes that those people trying to deceive the Christian brethren would be separated from the Christians. However, here's what the NIV says, starting in verse 10:

"I am confident in the Lord that you will take no other view. The one who is throwing you into confusion, whoever that may be, will have to pay the penalty... As for those agitators, I wish they would go the whole way and emasculate themselves!"

emasculate (v): to castrate; to deprive a male of certain parts which characterize the sex

(See 'emasculate', American Dictionary of the English Language, Noah Webster, 1828, retrieved Nov 6, 2014 [webstersdictionary1828.com])
Thus, in the NIV, it is teaching Christians to wish that atheists would emasculate themselves. Because Sye Tenbruggencate quotes from the NIV, I would have to assume that he studies it and believes in what it teaches, so concerning those people who believe what the NIV teaches (that atheists ought to emasculate themselves), I would describe those folks as unreasonable, psychologically disturbed quacks that are borderline lunatics.

Presuppositional apologetics relies on the presupposition of the Word of God to be true first BEFORE analyzing any evidence, just as the atheist presupposes that it is false before analyzing any evidence. The problem that many of the PA's are unwilling to understand is that the presupposition of new-age versions is different than the presupposition of the KJB, because the KJB offers the presupposition of the perfect God, whereas the new-age versions offer a presupposition of a "god" that contradicts himself, thus resulting in preachers in error (like Sye) who preach a God of non-contradiction, while holding up a "bible" of a "god" that contradicts himself.

The new-age versions are supporting the lies of atheists and humanists because they are helpful in deceiving others. A God-hating atheist website that uses a King James Bible can be disproven, often with relative ease, but others that use new-age versions cannot be disproven in all cases because those books contain real contradictions. How do we expect to rightly-divided Word of the Lord Jesus Christ if we study a new-age book that contradicts His doctrines? How do we expect to preach of the Lord God who cannot lie, if we hold up books that contain lies?

The big problem is that once an atheist would admit he has no foundation for knowledge or reason, people like Sye would turn him to a book that describes his foundation for knowledge and reason to have direct, obvious contradictions. Just as the testimony of the man aforementioned, many would come to see the Bible as a fraud if they study a new-age version.

Questions & Arguments

**Question:** What's with the thees, thous, eths, and ests?

For many new-age versions, this was an advertising point, claiming that their new-age version is like the King James Bible, just without the thee's and thou's. In fact, many ignorant shoppers, looking for a leavened study "bible" in a "Christian" book store, specifically ask for a bible without the thees and thous, but this is because they have no idea the importance of those words.

In modern American English, we use the word "you" to represent all singular and plural pronouns, and without a bit a visual context, it is sometimes impossible to know who is being addressed by just simply saying "you." The study of the English language has seriously dropped to a child-like level in the U.S. over the past 100 years, especially with the invention of texting, and very important distinctions of context are left out of the average education.
Now let's look at a Biblical example, when Nicodemus approaches Christ to ask him some questions:

The Lord Jesus Christ tells Nicodemus that all must be born-again, but let's read that from the English Standard Version: "Do not marvel that I said to you, *You must be born again*" Because "you" represents both plural and singular pronouns in modern-day watered-down English, we do not know if Christ is talking to a group "you" or to a single person "you," which means this verse could easily be interpreted to mean that only Nicodemus specifically had to be born-again.

The "eths" and "ests" are commonly referred to as "beautiful poetry" in the King James Bible, but it has nothing to do with poetry. Eths and ests (or sometimes just "st") specifically point to the person that's being spoken to, giving us more context.

Let's look at an example from the next verse in John 3:8, in the image below. -John 3:8

So ultimately, without the thees, thous, eths, and ests, there is a lot of context that's missing. In Greek and Hebrew, there are words that distinguish personage, and the KJB translators used proper words to reflect that, but in modern-day American English, we just go with "you" to mean just about anything we want. This leaves the Bible to open personal interpretations, which is Satan's plan.
Though there are many hundreds of examples that could be given, let's look at one more example from Acts 5:

*Whiles it remained, was it not thine [2nd Person Singular = Ananias] own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine [2nd Person Singular = Ananias] own power? why hast thou [2nd Person Singular = Ananias] conceived this thing in thine heart? thou [2nd Person Singular = Ananias] hast not lied unto men, but unto God. And Ananias hearing these words fell down, and gave up the ghost: and great fear came on all them that heard these things. -Acts 5:4-5*

Now if we read that in an English Standard Version, there's a new spin put on it: "While it remained unsold, did it not remain your [2nd Person Plural = All Those Together With Ananias] own? And after it was sold, was it not at your [2nd Person Plural = All Those Together With Ananias] disposal? Why is it that you [2nd Person Plural = All Those Together With Ananias] have contrived this deed in your heart? You [2nd Person Plural = All Those Together With Ananias] have not lied to man but to God." Why is it that only Ananias was punished for something they all did? The new-age version reader can claim that it was only Ananias that did the deed, but they have to base that on assumption because their "bible" doesn't specify who Peter is talking to.

If someone wants to remove the thees, thous, ests, and eths, then they have to start making assumptions about God's Word; filling in the blanks on their own, instead of allowing God's Word to interpret itself.

Another example would be out of Young's Literal Translation, which reads the following for Genesis 1:

1. In the beginning of God's preparing the heavens and the earth [It starts off with a first person sentence, but watch the change. And It doesn't say that God created them, but He was "preparing" them, implying evolutionary billions of years.]
2. and God saith, 'Let light be;' and light is.
3. And God seeth the light that [it is] good, and God separateth between the light and the darkness,
4. and God calleth
5. And God saith
6. And God maketh the expanse,
7. And God calleth to the expanse
8. And God saith
9. And God calleth to the dry land
10. And God saith, etc...

In Young's Literal Translation, God is spoken of in the third person, so who is speaking to us in this text? We have no idea. The problem here is that this is not necessarily God's Word, but someone else's word telling us about God. (i.e. It's man's word, not God's Word.)

*And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness. -Genesis 1:4*

Notice that the King James Bible did not say "divideth" or "dividest," but it used the first person form of the verb to know who is speaking. There are multiple places where Young's Literal Translation changes from using "saith" to "said" when referring to the same person in the same context, which means it is a literal translation -- it's literally wrong!

**Opposing Argument: The King James Bible is just too hard to read.**

Those who make this argument have no clue what they're saying, and typically, when someone makes this argument, it's a good indicator that you're dealing with someone who doesn't bother to check out facts, but rather, he/she is just looking to make excuses for themselves. 

The Flesch-Kincaid research company did analysis of bible versions, and compared to standard grade school reading levels: **"The KJV ranks easier in 23 out of 26 comparisons. (Their formula is: (.39 x average number of words per sentence) + (11.8 x average number of syllables per word) - (15.59) = grade level. The first chapter of the first and last books of both the Old and New Testaments were compared. (All complete sentences, whether terminating in a period, colon, or semi-colon, and all incomplete phrases ending in a period, were calculated as 'sentences'.)"**

The KJB is averaging between 1-3 grade school levels lower in its overall difficulty of reading, and this is because it uses less complicated words that use less syllables per word. Let's look at examples of this in the NASV vs the KJB, and count out the syllables in each word as you read through these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCRIPTURE</th>
<th>NASV (Hard)</th>
<th>KJB (Easy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mat 1:11, 1:17</td>
<td>deportation</td>
<td>carried away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 1:20</td>
<td>considered</td>
<td>thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 2:1, 2:7</td>
<td>magi</td>
<td>wise men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2:21</td>
<td>unshrunk</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 27:27</td>
<td>Praetorium</td>
<td>common hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 15:16</td>
<td>whole Roman cohort</td>
<td>band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 2:16</td>
<td>environs</td>
<td>coasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 3:21, Luke 3:17</td>
<td>winnowing fork</td>
<td>fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 5:15, Mar 4:21</td>
<td>peck-measure</td>
<td>bushel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 5:19</td>
<td>annuls</td>
<td>break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 5:29, Mat 8:11</td>
<td>reclining at the table</td>
<td>sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 9:38</td>
<td>beseech</td>
<td>pray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 10:1</td>
<td>summoned</td>
<td>called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 10:10</td>
<td>tunics</td>
<td>coats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 15:6</td>
<td>invalidated</td>
<td>made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 15:17</td>
<td>eliminated</td>
<td>cast out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 16:27</td>
<td>recompense</td>
<td>reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 17:24</td>
<td>two-drachma tax</td>
<td>tribute money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 20:15</td>
<td>generous</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 8:36</td>
<td>forfeit</td>
<td>lose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 20:2</td>
<td>denarius</td>
<td>penny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 23:37</td>
<td>were unwilling</td>
<td>would not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 25:10</td>
<td>make the purchase</td>
<td>buy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 26:50</td>
<td>seized</td>
<td>took</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many hundreds of these examples I could give throughout the entire New Testament, but this should be plenty to get the point across. In fact, Dr. Frank Logsdon, co-founder of the New American Standard Version quoted in the above chart, wrote a letter to Cecil Carter of Prince George, British Columbia on June 9, 1977, in which he renounced the NASV, and realized the judgment he would face before the Lord God for changing the Bible:

"I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard version. I'm afraid I'm in trouble with the Lord... We laid the groundwork; I wrote the format; I helped interview some of the translators; I wrote the preface... I'm in trouble; I can't refute these arguments; it's wrong, terribly wrong; it's frighteningly wrong; and what am I going to do about it? When questions began to reach me, at first I was quite offended... I used to laugh with the others... However, in attempting to answer, I began to sense that something was not right about the New American Standard Version."
I can no longer ignore these criticisms I am hearing and I can't refute them. The deletions are absolutely frightening... there are so many... Are we so naive that we do not suspect Satanic deception in all this?

Upon investigation, I wrote my very dear friend, Mr. Lockman, explaining that I was forced to renounce all attachment to the NASV.

The product is grievous to my heart and helps to complicate matters in these already troublous times... I don't want anything to do with it. The finest leaders that we have today haven't gone into it [the new version's use of a corrupted Greek text] just as I hadn't gone into it; that's how easily one can be deceived.

I'm going to talk to him [Dr. George Sweeting, president of Moody Bible Institute] about these things.

You can say the Authorized Version (KJV) is absolutely correct. How correct? 100% correct. I believe the Spirit of God led the translators of the Authorized Version. If you must stand against everyone else, stand!

[Signed] Dr. Frank Logsdon, Co-founder NASB"


The day after a speech I once gave in Columbus, OH, the man in charge of the meeting was really upset and tried to get me to throw down my King James Bible, claiming that the NASV was better. I sent him Frank Logsdon's own testimony, and here's what I received in return:

"Do you think that I am going to answer all of this rambling? I will not. You prove yourself unworthy of it. I truly aspire to the humility that we are called to... When you are in Ohio, DO NOT attend any JBS or LHC event. You will be rejected at the door. DO NOT communicate with me again. Any communication from you will be deleted or destroyed."

-Mike Tomaso, member of the John Birch Society, in a letter to Chris Johnson, May, 2010

I won't post the entire letter here, but it is written in a hate-filled rage that I've not commonly seen, but when people aren't open to hearing rebuke and reproof, they react in disorderly manner.

Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us. For yourselves know how ye ought to follow us: for we behaved not ourselves disorderly among you; -2 Thessalonians 3:6-7

I find it incredibly hypocritical that so many of these new-age version users will claim the King James Bible is harder to read and understand, but when one of them encounters a thief, they'll tell their friends and family, "That guy took my stuff!" They don't say "That guy took my possessions!" or "That guy took my goods!" Their usage of the word "stuff" is a King James term.

Whereas thou hast searched all my stuff, what hast thou found of all thy household stuff? set it here before my brethren and thy brethren, that they may judge betwixt us both. -Genesis 31:37

But other versions have changed it to words and phrases that we don't use in our common language today. When you drive over to give someone a ride, which of the following do you say?

- "Get your possessions, let's go."
- "Get your goods, let's go."
- "Get your vessels, let's go."
- "Get your stuff, let's go."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIV</td>
<td>my goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESV</td>
<td>my goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASV</td>
<td>my goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV</td>
<td>my goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YLT</td>
<td>my vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCSB</td>
<td>my possessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English speaking people mimic the King James Bible in their speech all the time, and they don't realize it, but they have been trained by new-age scribes in evolutionary philosophy that modern-man is smart and ancient man is dumb, and that we need their enormous brains and massive intellect to show us the way to truth.

*The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple.* -Psalm 119:130

If you believe this verse is true, which Bible is God's Word?

**Question:** If we have God's Word preserved in English, what about other languages?

I understand how this is a concerning question to a lot of people, but to those who ask it, I usually return a question:

*"In the days of the Old Testament before Christ, in how many languages was the Bible written?"* The answer is: One language - Hebrew. It should not be a shocking thing for Christians to learn that God preserves His Word in a single chosen language, because with some exceptions in Daniel and Ezra, the entire Old Testament was written of inspiration of God in the Hebrew language, and also preserved by the tribe of Levi in that language.

God's chosen language to have the Old Testament written and preserved was Hebrew, but then changed the language to have the New Testament written in [Koine] Greek, a common language among the Gentiles.

*For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.* -Romans 1:16

*But glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile:* -Romans 2:10

Previously, the Levites were charged with protection and preservation of the written Word, but now it is being handled by those born-again through Christ in His Church, which means God's Word is now open to outsiders (wolves in sheep's clothing) seeking to change God's Word to their own liking. Because of this, there will be many false teachings running through many different languages, and now that we have the Old Testament in Hebrew, and the New Testament in Greek, both the old and the new will be combined into one preserved Bible, so God will end up preserving His Word through another chosen language, that being English though the King James Bible.

God preserved His Word through what is considered the height of excellence in the history of the English language; a peak in its development in the 16th century, and not only the language was developed, but the movable type printing press had also just been invented, allowing mass publication of God's Word to spread throughout the world via two of the world's most powerful and influential countries between the 16th and 20th centuries, England and the U.S.A., both English-speaking countries. Today, although Mandarin and Spanish are popular due to the number of citizens who speak their native language, English is the most common language around the world, and many countries not only offer English courses, but some countries (like Japan) REQUIRE English courses to graduate from high school, as well as requirements in businesses and the military.

Thus as the Jews had responsibility to uphold the Word of God in Hebrew, and as the former-Gentiles (born-again) had responsibility to uphold the Word of God in Greek, we Christians have a responsibility to uphold the Word of God in English, as a fully completed Bible (both Old and New Testaments), and share that with others around the world.
Opposing Argument: King James was a homosexual.

"James," of whom the title of the KJB is named after, was James Charles Stewart, son of the Catholic Mary, Queen of Scots (cousin of "Bloody" Mary I of England). As an infant, James had the blessing to be raised away from Catholic teachers, was instructed in Presbyterian schooling, and because of this, he was subject to many plots attempting to overthrow and discredit him. Despite the conspiracies, he became King James I of England on March 24, 1603, formerly King James VI in Scotland, uniting the countries together after centuries of war, and ruled for 22 years before his death in 1625.

(CORRECTION: On the audio teaching, I mistakenly said that Mary, Queen of Scots was "Bloody Mary." One of our listeners pointed this out to me, and I corrected this article. Sadly, I cannot correct the audio recording, so I hope others will read this correction because it's the best I can do to fix the error.)

We will address the accusations of homosexuality momentarily, but I would like to first give some quotations about James' character from people who knew him, rather than mainstream slander. English author, diplomat, and politician Sir Henry Wotton said the following about James C. Stewart:

"There appears a certain natural goodness verging on modesty...among his good qualities none shines more brightly than the chasteness [i.e. purity] of his life, which he has preserved without stain down to the present time, contrary to the example of almost all his ancestors, who disturbed the kingdom with the great number of bastards which they left..."


Godfrey Goodman (1582-1656), former Dean of Westminster and protestant, known for his lavish charity to the poor, said:

"Here unto you may add the carriage and disposition of King James; truly I did never know any man of so great an appreciation, of so great love and affection. A man so truly just, so free from all cruelty and pride, such a lover of the church, and one who had done so much good for the church."


And despite the attacks often read by those seeking to justify new-age versions, Robert Chambers said that James "was very much beloved by his people."


Now more specifically to the accusations of sodomy against James Stewart. First of all, James hated the acts of effeminism.

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, -1 Corinthians 6:9
effeminate (adj): men having the qualities of the female sex; soft or delicate to an unmanly degree; womanish
(See 'effeminate'. American Dictionary of the English Language, Noah Webster, 1828, retrieved Nov 5, 2014 [webstersdictionary1828.com])

James instructed his eldest son, Henry, in the following way:

"But especially eschew [i.e. hate] to be effeminate in your clothes, in perfuming, preining, or such like... and make not a fool of yourself in disguising or wearing long your hair or nails,"

In the Basilikon Doron (Greek meaning Royal Gift), James Stewart's treatise on government written in the form of a letter to his son, he said:

"... so is there some horrible crimes that ye are bound in conscience never to forgive: such as Witch-craft, wilfull murder, incest, (especially within the degrees of consanguinity) Sodomy, poisoning, and false coin." [edited for modern spelling]

James Stewart spent fifteen days in prayer before entering into marriage with Anne of Denmark because he took marriage with the upmost seriousness:

"But the principal blessing that you can get of good company will stand, in your marrying of a godly and virtuous wife... being flesh of your flesh and bone of your bone... Marriage is the greatest earthly felicity... without the blessing of God you cannot look for a happy marriage... When you are married, keep inviolably your promise made to God in your marriage, which all stands in doing of one thing, and abstaining from another, to treat her in all things as your wife and the half of yourself, and to make your body (which then is no more yours but properly hers) common with none other.

I trust I need not to insist there to dissuade you from the filthy vice of adultery, remember only that solemn promise you made to God at your marriage... And for your behavior to your wife, the Scripture can best give you counsel therein."

Homosexuals don’t go around saying/writing stuff like this. So where did the accusations of James Stewart and homosexuality come from?

A man by the name of Anthony Weldon was a part of James Stewart's court, but due to his hatred of the Scots, running his mouth and writing anti-Scottish sentiments, King James dismissed Weldon from court. Although James could have had Weldon publicly executed (as was traditional punishment), but instead dismissed him discreetly, and even gave him a pension to live on. But Weldon had lost his lavish life-style and would seek revenge, along with two other men who James had removed, namely Francis Osborne and Edward Peyton.

What further enraged these men is that King James elevated commoners over royal/noble lineage, for example, Robert Carr. In reaction to the King's decision, Francis Osborne said:

"Robert Carr from a poor page, and to the dishonor of our ancient nobility, raised him to as high a title as most Earls of England."

In addition to this, Edward Peyton was so known for his violent temper that he was removed from court by George Villiers. And thus, we have three men who wanted revenge.
James died in 1625, and 25 years later, in 1650, Weldon sought to get a little revenge:

"Weldon then wrote a treatise that incriminated all the objects of his, Osborne's, and Peyton's hatred. He did not openly accuse the king of sodomy, but alluded to King James' being an open homosexual with George Villiers and Robert Carr... He [Weldon] didn't allow for his charges to be published until after his death."


How coincidental for an accusation of homosexual activity to come from a few men who had their personal pride wounded to write out lies after everyone involved was dead. Obviously, the people who knew James Stewart knew this document was smut, so how is it that the childish lies of Weldon and Peyton suddenly resurfaced today?

Moody Monthly, a supposedly "Christian" publication who states that, "Moody exists to equip people with the truth of God's Word to be maturing followers of Christ who are making disciples around the world," published a couple of articles about James the I of England in which they dug up the lies created by Weldon. One called "The Real King James," by Karen Ann Wojohn, and another called "The Bible That Bears His Name," by Leslie Keylock. A number of websites I looked into have stated that Moody publications was contacted multiple times by different organizations and asked to provide some evidence of their accusations of sodomy, or else retract those articles, but Moody Monthly never responded.

He that refuseth instruction despiseth his own soul: but he that heareth reproof getteth understanding.
- Proverbs 15:32

Correction is grievous unto him that forsaketh the way: and he that hateth reproof shall die. -Proverbs 15:10

As a side note, I find it fascinating that Moody Monthly was more than willing to get a couple of busybodies to make false accusations against King James, but never bothered to speak a word when actual homosexual activity was discovered to be going on in the creation of the New International Version.

(Read "The NIV Promotes Homosexuality" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)

Other accusations come from segments of James Stewart's own writings, like this example from a homosexual-endorsing book quoting James:

"I, James, am neither a god nor an angel, but a man like any other. Therefore I act like a man and confess to loving those dear to me more than other men. You may be sure that I love the Earl of Buckingham more than anyone else, and more than you who are here assembled. I wish to speak in my own behalf and not to have it thought to be a defect, for Jesus Christ did the same, and therefore I cannot be blamed. Christ had his John, and I have my George."


We live in a sex-crazed, adulterous, fornicating, homosexual society, and thus, everything they read is interpreted through those glasses, so horribly to the point that many people make sexual innuendos out of everything they see and hear. Everything in media, movies, music, news, magazines, and on the internet is about sex. And so when someone perverted reads something pure from the mouths of men who had no sexual intent between one another, who were such close friends, they will twist it to infer sexual desire from it because that's how corrupt the hearts of man have become.

A man cannot express his love (favor) for another man without being considered a homosexual in today's perverted American society. Woe unto our nation; we need the Judgment of the Lord God and Salvation of Jesus Christ desperately!
Here's another example, in which the Duke of Buckingham was writing to James Stewart:

"I naturally so love your person, and adore all your other parts, which are more than ever one man had,"

Thus, the queer folk of this nation try to get people to think there was sexual intercourse happening between James and the Duke of Buckingham. This is obviously describing the parts of his person in context, but those who have a hate-filled agenda could care less. Those that are pushing the propaganda don't tell you is that this was a common phrase between people during that era, and even Anthony Weldon himself used it:

"Sir Anthony Weldon in describing Sir Thomas Overbury '... a man of excellent parts'... Sir Anthony Weldon in describing a lady's character: 'The honorable esteem I have ever had of you and your brave parts'... Sir Walter Scott's notation of Sir James Ephington '...a man of excellent parts...'"

It is only through the mouths of liars and sick perverts that make these accusations, and namely because most of them hate the Christian God of the Bible, so they would hate anyone who had anything to do with the making of the King James Bible, through which God preserved His Word in perfection, and condemns their sin through it. This section is not so much a defense of King James I, because he's not the final authority in all matters of faith and practice, but a revealing of the truth behind the hearts of those who spread lies to justify their wicked desires.

**Opposing Argument:** King James was a Freemason.

King James (I of England and VI of Scotland) has also been accused of being a Mason. Much of this controversy has come from a Masonic website, which is usually good at documenting famous Freemasons, that said the following:

"On the west wall of the lodge hall used by Lodge Scoon and Perth No. 3 in Perth, Scotland can be found a mural depicting James VI kneeling at their altar at his initiation. The oldest existing record of the Lodge, called 'The Mutual Agreement' of 24 December, 1658, records that James was 'entered Freemason and Fellowcraft of the Lodge of Scoon' on 15 April, 1601."

Before I explain this in more detail, I want Christians to understand that King James is not a god, so he needs to stopped being worshipped as if he is one; he is not the deciding factor to whether or not the King James Bible is the Word of God.

Also, King James did not write the Bible, nor did he translate it; the only part he played in the making of the King James Bible was appointing a committee (who, I'd like to add, were completely volunteer and unpaid), so even if he was a Mason, it wouldn't have any effect on the truth of the preserved Word of God.

The reason King James is attacked so much is because these people cannot find a legitimate and logical way to attack the King James Bible, since it's God's perfect and preserved Word, so instead, they attack the guy whose name is attached to it, and (in their childish foolishness) think they can somehow destroy the reverence of the King James Bible if they can destroy the image of King James.

There is a YouTube video (referenced below) I saw in which this Grand Lodge website was shown as evidence that King James was a Mason, but what was really interesting was that the author of the video cut out the fine print at the bottom of the page. The average viewer, drawn in by the dramatic music and video presentation, would not even catch this, but going to the website itself and reading the fine print, it says:
"Note that the Contract or Mutual Agreement is the only record of this initiation, that this history was commissioned by the lodge to establish its claims of precedence, and there is no primary source documentation."


Isn't it odd that a King, at the head of the most powerful nation in the world at that time, would not have more information documented somewhere about his involvement with Freemasonry? At the very least, would there not be a testimony or a note mentioned by someone who knew him? The document they're referring to on the website, by their own admission, is a commission by Freemasons to establish THEIR CLAIMS of who were members of their lodge, and that there is no primary source to back up those claims.

If you follow the links provided on this website, you can find a contextual overview of the Contract or Mutual Agreement of 1658 concerning King James VI:

Once again, if we simply read to the bottom, we find that Edward Macbean, who is a Junior Warden Mason and researcher who studied the claims of the Freemasons' document from 1658, said that there's nothing to back up the claim:

"Edward Macbean claims that the initiation of James VI, King of Scotland, is apocryphal, and it must be noted that there is no primary source documentation."


**apocryphal (adj):** uncertain authority or credit; false; fictitious
(See 'apocryphal', American Dictionary of the English Language, Noah Webster, 1828, retrieved Jan 4, 2017 [webstersdictionary1828.com])

Here's a quotation directly from Edward Macbean's book:

"The minute is signed by the new master, warden, and thirty-eight members... this certificate, however, does not vouch for the historical accuracy of its contents, and we may remark that the reception of the Scottish King is generally considered apocryphal."


This means that the claim that King James was a Freemason is labeled as fictitious because it has no authentication or any corroborating evidence, yet, the Grand Lodge website decided to list him out as a Freemason anyway. It would be smart to do that from the lodge's perspective, because if the claim were true, and they could convince born-again Christians to follow in the footsteps of James instead of Christ (which James himself would abhor based on what I've seen of his writings), then it would help increase the numbers of their lodge and decrease the number of people exposing their order as evil. It makes sense for Lucifer, who is the god of Freemasonry, because his primary goal is getting people away from the Word of God.

(Read "Freemasonry: A Luciferian Beacon" here at creationliberty.com for more details.)
Another common attack on the King James Bible is the use of what are called "Masonic Handshakes" used in the genealogy charts that were artistically drawn out and added to the original printing. I've done my best to highlight them in this image.

So the real question is: What is the backing evidence that these are Masonic handshakes? The problem with this argument is that it is all based on the premise that King James was a Mason, and that King James had anything to do with the actual creation of the King James Bible, both of which are false.

Is any handshake automatically Masonic? That would obviously be a ludicrous argument to make, but it seems to be the general premise when it comes to hatred of the King James Bible. Author Leonard Huber wrote a book called Clasped Hands: Symbolism in New Orleans Cemeteries, in which he pursued research into the "handshake" symbol that's put on tombstones throughout history, and was commonly done in New Orleans in the 1800s.

"In most all representations of a man and woman holding hands, the woman's hands are always to the left with the man’s hands to the right. This symbol means "holy-matrimony-of union."


This means that the handshakes are not Masonic handshakes, but representation that the two people connected are married, which you can verify by simply checking out the names in the chart. Believe it or not, there is actually a group that studies gravestones, called The Association for Gravestone Studies, and one researcher in this group points out:

"Hands are found on many gravestones... Handshakes may be farewells to earthly existence or may be clasped hands of a couple to be reunited in death as they were in life, their devotion to each other not destroyed by death."


For those of you who are interested in this, you may have to get out a magnifying glass, or zoom in on your computer to get a good look at this. If you click on the image of the genealogy chart to get a larger view, you can look very carefully at the handshakes and notice that the cuffs of the two hands are not the same in every image, and this is because the male and female partners are represented by the cuff (i.e. the male has a cufflink, where the female has a cuff that would more typically be seen on a dress).

This means it's impossible that these handshakes are Masonic because women are not allowed to be in Masonic fraternities. Some may argue things like the female section of Freemasonry, such as the Order of the Eastern Star, but that group didn't exist until the mid-1800s. A blogger that researches southern gravestones shows a larger example of this tradition carved directly into a gravestone:

"If you look a little more closely, you will notice the sleeve attached to one hand is feminine, and the sleeve attached to the other hand is masculine. These hands, carved in this way, symbolize holy matrimony."


One of the pages of artwork shows a handshake between Adam and Eve; are we then to conclude that Adam and Eve were Freemasons? It's ridiculously absurd to even consider.
I understand that people who hate the King James Bible won't care about any of this information, and they'll continue to spread lies anyway. I just wrote this for Christians to gain understanding. In their wicked hearts, most of these people really hate the truth of the Word of God, and they want any excuse they can come up with in order to reject the KJB because it rebukes the sin they love so much.

Questions to Ask New-Age Version Users

Since we have so many new-age version users posing questions trying to cast doubt on the King James Bible, let's return some questions:

**If the King James Bible is fallible, would you point out a better version?**

This is often a good way to get them to point to their new-age version, from which you can point out errors and omissions.

**Do you have a perfect Bible?**

Of course, most will say no, because most people believe there is no perfect Bible. Yet, Scripture tells us that God's Word is pure and that the Lord is perfect in all his ways.

**If not, why do you call your bible "God's Word?"**

or

**Why do you attribute an imperfect bible to a perfect God?**

We constantly hear new-age version users use terms like "the Greek says," or "the Hebrew says," or "the originals say," or "a better rendering would be," or "the older manuscripts say," but we don't see that in the Bible.

**Why didn't the Apostles, nor Jesus Christ Himself, ever argue for originals or special translations?**

There are quite a few new-age version users out there who attempt to preach that Jesus is the only way. **Since there are many false churches, many false religions, many false ways to heaven, and many false gods, why do you think there are not many false bibles?**

Some of their answers might be surprising, as it will reveal their true presuppositions are not founded in relying on the perfect and pure Word of God. Hopefully, you can use the information in this article to help them understand the fallacy of using new-age corruption.

As a final note, I'd like to quote a textual critique by the name of Kenneth Clark, who is still honored by Duke Divinity School and many scholars around the world. Most Christians are intimidated by such men of renown scholarly intellect, but I want to reveal the true nature of what they really believe. The King James Bible is not what needs defending as much as God's ability and deed to preserve His Word for us.

The men who do not believe in relying on God's Preserved Word, and looking to external sources to construct a bible version on their own, use that method known as the "eclectic method." Let's look at what Clark says:

"The eclectic method, by its very nature, belongs to an age like ours [scribal elites of academia] in which we know only that the traditional theory of the text [i.e. the textus receptus on which the KJB relies] is faulty but cannot yet see clearly to correct the fault."


In case you didn't understand what he just said, the scribal elites that scoff at the KJB don't know what's right; they only believe that the KJB and the textus receptus is wrong. They're seeking to correct something, and they don't even know what correct is supposed to look like.

Since the blessings of understanding have passed from Jew to Gentile, so too has responsibility. We, the church, not the intellectual elites of society, have the authority to protect and preserve the Word of God. We Christians are the ones the Lord God has given authority to concerning the preservation of His Word, so let's not be lazy and do our job.